

**Penultimate Agenda**  
Vapor Workgroup  
Department of Ecology Headquarters Building, Lacey WA  
Room 3F - 10  
September 24, 2010  
10 am – noon  
Call-In Phone Number (360-407-3780) – PIN 827850#

Meeting Goals

- Provide brief status report rulemaking process
- Review and discuss draft revisions describing the tiered VI decision-making process
- Review and discuss draft revisions to Section 750 (air cleanup levels)
- Identify remaining issues

10:00-10:15     Introductions, Status Update and Meeting Overview

10:15-11:00     Tiered Decision-Making Process (Revisions based on Work Group comments)

Discussion Question:

Do the draft revisions sufficiently address comments that you provided on the initial draft language? If not, what is missing?

We have included some new provisions regarding the application of institutional controls.

- Given your experience working on vapor intrusion problems, do these provisions make sense? If not, why not?
- Are there other issues related to institutional controls that you believe should be addressed in rule or guidance?

We included some new provisions regarding the implementation of interim actions to address the vapor intrusion pathway.

- Do you believe that Ecology should consider establishing interim action trigger levels? If yes, do you believe this belongs in rule or in guidance, and why?
- If yes, do you agree that the acute Minimal Risk Levels (MRLs) established by ATSDR provide a reasonable basis for those values?
- Are there other approaches (such as multiples of the screening levels) that would provide a reasonable basis for interim action trigger levels?

11:00-11:50     Draft Revisions to Section 750

Discussion Question:

Do you agree that the draft revisions are consistent with the EPA inhalation risk assessment guidance published in 2009? If not, why not?

We are considering dividing the current Section 750 into a series of smaller sections. Do you think this approach will help improve rule usability and clarity?

Do the draft revisions provide a clear and understandable linkage to the vapor intrusion decision-making process? If not, how can we improve that linkage?

We have drafted several new provisions on methods for determining compliance.

- Given your experience working on vapor intrusion problems, do these provisions make sense? If not, why not?
- Does the draft language on multiple lines of evidence provide an appropriate level of flexibility to make site-specific compliance decisions?
- We recognize that the draft rule revisions are fairly detailed. What do you think is the appropriate balance between rule language and guidance materials?

11:50-noon      Recap and Next Meeting